DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 691 CS 201 610

AUTHOR Sterling, Christopher H.
TITLE Trends in a Half-Century of Broadcast Station and Daily Newspaper Ownership 1922-1970.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (57th, San Diego, California, August 18-21, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Broadcast Industry; *Communications; Higher Education; *Mass Media; *Media Research; News Media; *Newspapers; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Media Ownership

ABSTRACT

This study examined the extent to which media ownership has been concentrated in the top 100 markets over the past half centry, specifically examining trends in broadcasting and cross media (newspaper and broadcasting) ownership within each of these markets. The sample was based on use of the years 1922 and each decennial census year since, alloving a comparison of media growth, ownership status, and population data. The findings of the study were that the number of media outlets in the top markets increased by 270 percent while the number of voices increased by 185 percent over the 1922-70 period; since 1950 there has not been an increase in overall media ownership concentration; several trends suggest that concentration of ownership may increase by the time the 1980 data is examined; the proportion of independent or single station ownership remained constant in the last decade; newspaper control of broadcasting outlets and voices has declined to record low levels; and both media outlets and voices have increased in proportion faster than the population. The study concludes that various trends in the data suggest action may be called for in the future if the policy of diversified media control is to be maintained. (Author/RB)

ED 097691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRENDS IN A HALF-CENTURY OF BROADCAST STATION AND DAILY NEWSPAPER OWNERSHIP

1922-1970

prepared for delivery
before a session of the
Mass Communication and Society
division of the
Association for Education in Journalism
annual meeting,
San Diego, California
August 1974

Christopher H. Sterling
Associate Professor of Communications
Department of Radio-TV-Film
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Christopher H. Sterling

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

NOT TO BE CITED OR USED WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION (as paper has been submitted for publication)

OS 201 610

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Early in 1974, the U.S. Department of Justice asked the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to deny license renewal to newspaper-owned broadcasting stations in St. Louis, Des Moines, and Minneapolis--suggesting there would be more such filings in the future in a continuing and concerted attempt to diversify media control within given market areas.[1] Thus in well-publicised fashion, the Department provided impetus for the newest period of concern over the degree to which media ownership is concentrated in too few hands for the public interest. Under the pressure, the FCC dusted off its long-dormant 1970 proposed rule on the subject, and called major hearings for June 1974 to determine whether media owners should be allowed but a single broadcast station or one or more newspapers in a given market area.

The following paper seeks to answer the question of how much media control has been concentrated in the top 100 markets over the past half century, examining specifically the trends in broadcasting and cross-media (newspaper-broadcasting) ownership within those markets, rather than across them. The prime purpose of this is to provide some historical trend data on which current policy decisions can be made more rationally, for if as some contend, there is no such trend to increasing consolidation, then obviously no new rules are needed. If, on the other hand, a trend to concentration is evident, then remedial legislation or administrative rule-making may well be needed--and soon.

Developing Concern

As with most other questions in mass communication, interest in the media ownership problem is not new, even when one restricts his concern to broadcasting-related literature. Even before consistent federal regulation of radio, observers were wondering about station ownership, and the effect such ownership might have upon programming and information flow.[2] The issue was discussed in congressional hearings in the twenties and thirties, became clearly attached to growing concern over press

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

control of a large proportion of radio stations in the early forties, and was highlighted by a number of important cases and a lack of consistent government views.[3] In recent years, the ownership question has received increasingly detailed and well-expressed attention from both proponents and opponents of diversification.[4]

The modern period of concern over control concentration began in mid-1968 when the Justice Department filed a memorandum with the FCC urging adoption of a rule prohibiting cross-media combinations within a single market, and to consider a further rule to break up existing combinations.[5] While the FCC continued its case by case approach to the issue, it was increasingly pressured by the Justice Department (which began a series of specific filings against existing and proposed media combinations), FCC staff members dealing with constant license renewal problems, and even one or two commissioners, to come up with a definitive ownership policy guideline.[6] On March 25, 1970, the Commission adopted the proposed rule barring any owner of a full-time broadcasting station from acquiring another in the same market, whether AM, FM, or television. There were some exceptions to the rule, but essentially the new policy was to be one to a customer. At the same time, the FCC gave notice of a proposed rule-making with vast potential effect: within a five year period, any existing combination of stations and/or newspapers in any one market would have to be reduced by sale of various elements to no more than an AM-FM combination, a television station, or one or more newspapers. It was hinted that AM-FM combinations would soon be disallowed as well. The intent of all this was to diversify media control within single markets.[7] The March 25th rule and proposed rule marked the clearest FCC statement on ownership limits since the 1954 policy setting current broadcast station ownership limits of seven TV (no more than five of which could be VHF), seven AM, and seven FM stations to any single owner. The earlier policy has said nothing about how many markets the 21 stations could be spread over, and thus many radio-television combinations were established in single markets.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The media industry reaction to the new FCC rule and proposed rule was predictable disagreement, but the broadcast and newspaper lobbyies' actions were far more specific and to the point than in the past. Both the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) and American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA) contracted for detailed research studies on the current status of ownership concentration and its effects, and filed the lot with the Commission to back up their lengthy legal statements against the proposed rule. The present paper is based on research originally undertaken for the NAB, and now revised and updated.[8] After filing of the many reports and legal briefs on both sides of the question, the FCC appeared to lose interest in the ownership question until the early 1974 actions by the Justice Department brought the whole thing to life once again.

In the original scheme of several NAB research reports filed with the Commission in 1971, the present analysis was to provide a quantitative historical overview to determine trends in station and newspaper ownership over a long period of time to determine whether concentration was, in fact, increasing. The study was and is limited to ownership within each of the 100 top markets, rather than any analysis of ownership between or across many markets. In other words, the study focused on single market concentration rather than on those owners having stations or papers in several markets, and thus being concentrated in control only when several markets are considered at once. To deliniate between individual media units (stations or newspapers) and ownership organizations which might control several such media units, the following two key terms were developed: (1) outlet: an individual unit of daily media (an AM, FM, or television station, or a daily newspaper), in a given market; and (2) voice: a single ownership entity in a given market which might control anything from a single station or newspaper to any combination up to and including radio-television stations and newspapers in that market area.

Based on this approach, and the definitions above, as well as a research period of 1920 to 1970, the following hypotheses guided the study:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1) that while the number of broadcasting outlets and voices increased over the period covered, the number of daily newspaper outlets and voices decreased.

2) that media ownership (the proportion of voices to outlets for both stations and newspapers) had become more concentrated after 1950.

3) that broadcasting station ownership (the proportion of voices to outlets) had become more concentrated since 1950.

4) that the proportion of single independent stations had increased while the number of multiple-outlet broadcast voices within single markets had decreased since 1950.

5) that the proportion of newspaper-controlled broadcast outlets and voices had decreased relative to all broadcast outlets and voices.

6) that the proportion of group and/or conglomerate-controlled broadcasting outlets and voices had increased relative to all broadcast outlets and voices.

7) that AM-FM combinations had increased at a faster rate than radio-TV combinations since 1950.

8) that in the markets studied, the number of media outlets and voices had increased at a faster rate than population growth.

Method

Structuring the Sample: Having established the period for investigation as those years when broadcasting stations existed, it was decided to collect information for a sample of years and markets. The years used were 1922 (the first year when sizable numbers of broadcast stations were on the air), and the decennial census years from 1930 through 1970, thus allowing ready comparison between media status and population information.

To allow more comparability of data across both markets and years, the market deliniation criteria selected was the official government Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). When original research began on this project late in 1970,

the latest revised SMSA definitions available were those for 1967. Thus, for each of the sample years, media and population information was gathered for each of the largest 100 SMSAs as defined in 1967.[9] Today, the more common method of media market deliniation is to use the more refined Area of Dominent Influence (ADI) which better shows media coverage and economic impact in given cities without breaking them into such artifical political units as the SMSAs. The over-riding factor in choice of the SMSA rather than ADI unit, however, was that SMSA standard information is available from 1940 to data, and could be readily reconstructed for 1920 and 1930, simply by adding population and media information for those counties defined as being a part of the SMSA in 1967. For easier comparisons between years and market groupings (top 10, top 25, etc.), market rankings were held to their 1967 positions no matter what year was under consideration. While many cities grew and changed rank (the Southern and Western cities rose sharply in this period), this artificial freeze on position did not harm data gathering or presentation while adding convenience.

Within the selected years and markets, ownership information was gathered on all active broadcasting stations (AM, FM, and television, though the latter two do not figure in data here until 1950 as they developed after World War II)[10] and daily newspapers originating within the SMSA. The study thus eliminates all papers not published at least six times a week, cable television systems, and other media. Also excluded are media read or heard in the SMSA but which originate outside of it. It is believed that the stations and dailies reported on each represent the major daily media attended by the population of the given SMSAs, and there is no valid way to compare all media received in the top markets over this span of time.

Gathering and Defining Media Information: Station ownership data was gathered from issues of Broadcasting Yearbook from 1940 through 1970,[11] and from other sources for 1922 and 1930, when the Yearbook was not published.[12] Newspaper information for all sample years came from Editor and Publisher Yearbook.[13] Media ownership information was gathered for all communities in all counties defined as being in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

various SMSAs as of 1967. Information was entered on worksheets for each market and each year, resulting in some 800 pages of organized information.[14] Specific ownership classifications (see just below) were developed by the author and applied by him or two trained assistants. Tabular summary information, some of which is offered here, was developed by pairs of trained graduate students, each double-checking the other's work.[15] A detailed analysis of this work suggests an error ratio of about 3% for broadcasting data, and 2% for the lesser amount of newspaper information.

In organizing and discussing the ownership data, the following definitions were used to distinguish between different possible combinations of both newspapers and broadcasting. Definitional terms were the same for newspapers and broadcasting: (1) independent: a single station or single newspaper owned by an individual, firm, or institution which did not control any other medium in that market or elsewhere; (2) multiple: a combination of stations (AM-FM, or radio-television) or newspapers in a single market, owned by an individual, firm or institution which did not control any other medium in that market or elsewhere; (3) cross-media: any combination of newspapers and broadcast stations within a single market controlled by the same individual, firm, or institution (control defined as more than half or the biggest single ownership interest, whichever was applicable); (4) group: any combination of stations or newspapers in a single market controlled by an individual, firm, or institution (control defined as just above) which controls either broadcast stations or newspapers in other markets (thus a group is either all broadcasting, or all newspaper based); and (5) conglomerate: any combination of stations and newspapers in a single market controlled by an individual, firm or institution which also controls stations and newspapers (and often other media or non-media interests) in other markets. For both stations and newspapers, of course, it is possible that more than one category will fit a given situation. In such cases, ownership has been classified to the highest degree of concentration possible (thus a newspaper-owned radio station,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which would normally be classed as cross-media, will be classed as conglomerate instead if there are other media interests under the same ownership in other markets). This process may tend to under-rate the following categories: more, cross-media, and group.

Findings

For clarity, the results of the study are presented in paragraphs numbered to match the original hypotheses. Note the "outlet" and "voice" distinction throughout.

1. Almost needless to say, the total number of daily media outlets has grown tremendously--by nearly 270%. As seen in Table I, however, this overall conclusion which supports hypothesis 1, tends to hide several important trends--the most important of which is dramatic growth of broadcasting combined with a decline in daily newspapers. Looking first at outlets, we can see that for broadcasting (Table I-B), while there was a good deal of growth;up to 1940 (representing AM expansion only), there was a veritable explosion by 1950 (with addition of FM and television) and more than doubling of outlet numbers just in the two decades up to 1970. The growth rate increased as market size got smaller. For newspapers (Table I-C) there is a sharp decline up to 1940 brought about by the depression and other economic difficulties a decline which continued, though not so sharply, to 1950. But then by 1970, the number of dailies took an upturn, showing the rebirth of print media in suburbs of major cities. Overall, then, the outlet growth overall is a combination of major broadcast growth and overall newspaper decline (which may only now be changing over to a limited growth).

For voices, the results are much the same--although the lower percentages of growth suggest a trend to consolidation over the full half century. Note especially (Table I-C) the far larger decline of newspaper voices than newspaper outlets, numerical support for the oft-discussed consolidation trend in press ownership.

Table I Goes About Here

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE ::

Growth in Media Outlets and Voices: 1922-1970 Selected Years

Market Group	Outlets					Voices				
	Actual Number				Total Percent of Growth	Actual Number				Total Percent of Growth
	1922	1940	1950	1970		1922	1940	1950	1970	
A. Stations and Newspapers										
Top 10	286	296	502	793	177%	271	242	342	569	110%
Top 25	436	428	765	1337	206	401	344	514	966	141
Top 50	635	635	1174	2152	238	599	506	787	1566	161
Top 100	877	914	1718	3240	269	829	719	1159	2360	185
B. Broadcasting Stations Only										
Top 10	81	115	334	625	672%	81	111	221	455	462%
Top 25	134	179	529	1091	714	134	170	351	791	486
Top 50	185	267	822	1781	863	185	253	555	1293	599
Top 100	242	390	1215	2724	1026	242	367	842	1965	713
C. Daily Newspapers Only*										
Top 10	205	181	168	168	-18%	197	131	122	114	-42%
Top 25	302	249	236	246	-19	288	174	163	175	-39
Top 50	450	368	352	371	-18	434	253	232	273	-37
Top 100	635	524	503	521	-18	603	352	317	396	-34

*Note: for daily newspapers, percentage change figures are all declines, not growth.

2. Up through 1940, the media being discussed here were only two--AM radio and daily newspapers. By 1950, FM radio and television had been added. Thus to have suggested an increase in competition since 1922 would have been unfair and obvious, aside from hiding some important trends within that period. The figures in Table II-A suggest this to be correct, and support hypothesis two at the same time. Shown are the total proportion (voices to outlets) of concentration which grew slowly before 1950, took a decided leap at that time, and has declined slightly but steadily since then. Most of the increase prior to 1950 was in newspaper consolidations (and newspaper building or purchase of radio stations: the press controlled a third of all radio stations by 1940),[16] as broadcasting had little chance for consolidation before 1945 (see paragraph 3, below). The spurt in 1950 shows the natural entry by existing broadcasters into the new FM and television markets, thus increasing the degree of ownership concentration within markets as outlets rose while voices grew far more slowly as independent operators entered FM and television after 1950. Since 1950, the broadcast media have expanded sharply--AM has more than doubled, FM is up fourfold, and television outlets have increased by a factor of seven--and yet concentration is going down slowly each decade. This suggests the number of independent operators who have entered broadcasting since 1950. Interestingly there is little difference across market groupings. Hypothesis two, the most important one in the study, is rejected--concentration as defined here has declined rather than increased since 1950.

Table II goes about here

3. With the results immediately above, the third hypothesis is predictable--and it, too, is rejected, as there has been no increase in broadcasting concentration since 1950. It is again important to stress, however, that this hypothesis refers to 100 separate markets and not the overall situation, for which additional research would be necessary. In addition, no distinction was drawn between ownership of VHF or UHF television outlets, network affiliations, etc. and these factors might show additional internal trends of importance. Still, several important results are

TABLE II

Proportions of Media Concentration: 1922-70

Market Group	1922	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
A. Daily Media Concentration						
Top 10	.06	.12	.16	.30	.29	.28
Top 25	.08	.12	.18	.32	.29	.27
Top 50	.06	.10	.20	.32	.29	.27
Top 100	.06	.09	.21	.32	.30	.27
B. Broadcasting Concentration*						
Top 10	--	.02	.02	.34	.28	.28
Top 25	--	.03	.04	.33	.29	.27
Top 50	--	.02	.04	.32	.28	.27
Top 100	--	.01	.06	.28	.27	.28

* Note: as few if any broadcasters in 1922 owned more than one station (and because the sources for that year are not as complete as for later years), no figures for concentration are shown for 1922--though if they were they would all be on the order of .01 or .02, judging from figures shown for 1930.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

evident in Table II-B. Prior to 1941, there was little concentration as all stations were AM and in almost no case did one owner have more than a single station in the same SMSA. With the post-war development of FM and television, AM operators were naturally first into the newer media--leading to the concentration increase shown in 1950. As television growth was frozen for four years after 1948 (at just over 100 stations), and FM had peaked and begun to fall in number (for a variety of complicated reasons), neither medium had grown large or fast enough by 1950 to allow entry of many independent owners. The pattern set in 1950, however, persisted, with minor slippage, to 1960 and 1970. Though far more stations went on the air, the proportion controlled by owners of other media in the same market remained about the same, while many new independent owners controlled the rest. A comparison of Table I and II shows that the similiar proportions of Table II cover a vast increase in outlets shown in Table I.

Figures for 1980 will likely show a reversed trend back to increasing concentration, however. Already by 1970, this was evident as the decline in concentration had stopped in the top 10, and been slightly reversed already in the top 100 markets. The point is that nearly all available radio and television frequencies in these markets have been assigned and are on the air, thus closing the door for further station construction. As few independents have the needed capital to buy an existing media outlet, future ownership changes in broadcasting, as with newspapers before it, will likely be to or between some forms of more concentrated ownership. The effect is not unlike Turner's famous "frontier thesis" in that unlimited growth is now at an end, which will increase demand, and therefore costs of what is available. At this point, then, any FCC action on its proposed ruling would be more predictive regulation than remedial control.

One more point of importance. With the far larger number of broadcast than newspaper outlets, any increase in broadcast concentration will increase media concentration as well. With newspapers in a consolidation trend for some decades now, and broadcasting ever more likely to "round the curve"in the immediate future, the

proposed FCC rule on newspaper-broadcasting combinations begins to make at least quantitative sense. (Not dealt with here, of course, are the major policy problems of whether such concentration is "good" or "bad" from a number of points of view).

4. Table III , while it does not support hypothesis four, does lend further forboding hints to support the discussion above. To get the figures shown, station data for but three sample years could be included, as there were no FM or television stations in the earlier sample years, and thus no way to have multiple station ownership in any single market. Figures show the proportion of independent outlets and voices to multiple (either AM-FM, or radio-television) outlets and voices, averaged across four market groupings. Here again, the pattern disclosed earlier is demonstrated in a different way. From 1950 to 1960, there is a sharp increase in independent broadcast outlets and voices (with an even sharper increase in the latter case)--but within the range of error noted above, there is virtually no change in the outlets ratio since 1960, and only marginally more in voices. Here again is a suggestion that by 1980, the pattern of lessened concentration may be reveresed. The multiple stations can, of course, be owned by newspapers, broadcast groups, or conglomerates--but the trend potential is the same: the small independent is being squeezed as available frequencies are taken up and costs increase. This is most evident in the hotly contested top 10 markets where there has been no change in outlets, but a slight decline in independent voices. The bottom 50 markets show a decided slip in both independent outlets and voices. Here, however, the Commission has already acted with its 1970 ruling prohibiting further building or sale of station combinations. If that rule is adhered to, then the status quo in multiple to independent stations will hold, or even ease us a bit as multiples are sold, and in the process broken up because of the law.

Table III goes about here

TABLE III

Ratios of Independent to Multiple Broadcasters

Market Group	Outlets						Voices					
	1950		1960		1970		1950		1960		1970	
	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M
Top 10	37	63	50	50	50	50	55	45	69	32	68	32
Top 25	40	60	48	52	51	49	53	43	62	35	69	31
Top 50	43	57	50	50	51	49	57	41	67	32	69	31
Top 100	48	51	51	48	49	51	60	37	68	31	66	33

Note: for clarity, proportions are shown as whole numbers (37) whereas in reality they would be shown as decimals (.37). Figures, which would logically add to 100 to represent all stations in each market group, may not so add, due to rounding errors in sub-totals.

5. As seen in Table IV, hypothesis five is strongly supported. After peaking in 1940 (because of ownership of a major proportion of AM stations) and 1950 (because of similiar early domination of FM and television stations), press control has declined sharply whether one examines outlets or voices. The figures show the actual percentage of broadcast outlets and voices controlled by newspapers in the same market area. Clearly, newspapers are not a menacing force in broadcasting when examined in this fashion, though in individual markets, some papers have a strong hold on local media. This is true in some of the top 100 markets, but is even more so in smaller cities beyond the view of this research.

Table IV goes about here

6. Table V provides the data which clearly supports hypothesis six. Although there was an earlier peak in 1940 which has not yet been reached, group and conglomerate control of broadcast stations is on the rise and has been for two decades. The first rise of group-conglomerate control, from 1922 to 1940, can be explained by the increasing purchase of broadcast stations by groups fearful that all available broadcast (i.e., AM) frequencies in the major markets would soon be gone. After the war, with the arrival of FM and television which many groups were leery of because of questions about the need for FM and the costs of television, other owners (newspapers and independents) moved into broadcasting, dropping the ownership proportion of groups and conglomerates. With the success of FM and television soon assured, the economics of scale prevailed, and the groups began to grow again in importance--and continue to do so. Here there is a key difference by market groups--the first important one of the study--for it is obvious that group activity is concentrated in the marjor markets rather than smaller cities. It is also obvious from Table V, however, that something approaching stability controls the situation, as there has been little real change from 1960 to 1970 when the error ratio noted above is taken into account.

Table V goes about here

TABLE IV

Newspaper Control of Broadcasting

Market Group	1922	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
A. Newspaper Control of Broadcast Outlets						
Top 10	.04	.07	.16	.18	.09	.03
Top 25	.08	.11	.21	.20	.08	.03
Top 50	.12	.07	.21	.21	.09	.04
Top 100	.09	.07	.23	.21	.11	.04
B. Newspaper Control of Broadcast Voices						
Top 10	.09	.07	.17	.15	.07	.03
Top 25	.09	.10	.21	.21	.06	.02
Top 50	.06	.07	.21	.19	.06	.02
Top 100	.05	.07	.23	.19	.08	.03

TABLE V

Group-Conglomerate Control of Broadcasting

Market Group	1922	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
A. Group-Conglomerate Control of Broadcast Outlets						
Top 10	.16	.17	.40	.25	.35	.38
Top 25	.10	.11	.40	.19	.32	.34
Top 50	.05	.10	.45	.17	.31	.34
Top 100	.02	.06	.39	.14	.29	.32
B. Group-Conglomerate Control of Broadcast Voices						
Top 10	.15	.15	.37	.18	.29	.30
Top 25	.09	.09	.39	.15	.27	.28
Top 50	.04	.09	.42	.14	.27	.29
Top 100	.05	.07	.41	.12	.25	.28

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A word of caution is in order here, as the FCC proposed rule-making will not directly effect much of this particular ownership group. Many existing groups and conglomerates control only one station in a market although they have many stations in as many different markets. Only those groups with more than one full-time station in any given market would be affected by the rule-making, and it is likely that forced to sell an outlet in one market will encourage them to buy single stations in other cities--thus expanding the groups' influence, though in a different area and way.

7. Obviously combinations are the name of the game, and as is seen in supporting Table VI, hypothesis seven is supported in that radio combinations are more numerous than radio-television combinations. This result is somewhat obvious as there have always been far fewer television than radio stations--especially when one combines AM and FM stations which today number nearly 7,000 licensees compared to less than 1000 television stations. The table shows the actual numbers of each type of combination in the given market groups. The radio-television category includes three possible combinations: AM-TV, FM-TV, and AM-FM-TV. All of these combinations (save some AM-FM operations in special situations) are now banned for future sales or station construction, so their number will likely slowly diminish (see paragraph 4 , bottom of p. 12). Examination of the table suggests that most growth has been in the radio combinations, and this is graphic proof of the resurgence in the 1960s of FM broadcasting.

Table VI goes about here

8. Finally, hypothesis eight is supported, as both media voices and outlets have increased in number faster than population growth. Table VII was derived by dividing the number of media outlets into the population figures for each SMSA, and then averaging the results for each market grouping. For 1922 media information, comparison was made with 1920 census data--for all other years, media and population data are from the same year. Recognizing that larger numbers indicate more outlets

TABLE VI

Growth of Broadcast Voice Combinations

Market Group	Radio Only (AM-FM)			Radio-Television		
	1950	1960	1970	1950	1960	1970
Top 10	66	72	90	26	37	53
Top 25	100	113	169	44	75	83
Top 50	153	159	267	65	130	137
Top 100	228	315	408	84	218	217

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

per thousand persons, it is easy to see a familiar pattern here once again. Up to 1940, the number of outlets per 1000 declines as daily n ewspapers decrease in number, and available AM radio outlests fill up. After the war, the availability of new FM and television services increase the number of media outlets faster than population growth. There are distinct differences between outlets and voices and between market groups, however. The number of media outlets continues to grow apace much faster than population growth, but while voices are still growing larger than population gain, the increase is marginal except in the bottom 50 markets. Indeed for the top 50 markets, again keeping the error ratio in mind, population and media voice growth is virtually in a dead heat. As the number of available broadcast channels is filled up, and despite limited recent suburban growth in newspapers, it would seem that by 1980 this indicator will have turned as well, as population grows faster than creation of new media outlets, and certainly faster than creation of new voices.

Table VII about here

Discussion

As can be seen in the results above, as long as there were sufficient media channels which could be used technically and economically, the media ownership situation remained relatively diversified. When those channels became scarce, however, as with the long decline of newspapers, the lessening availability of AM channels in the late 1930s, or the limited number of remaining broadcast assignments in the early 1970s, monopoly trends within and between markets became increasingly pronounced in the industry. The message is clear--easy to state but hard to act upon--that as long as sufficient channels remain available for expansion of service and diversity of ownership, monopoly within markets should not become a problem in daily SMSA media. Defining "sufficient channels" is difficult, but theoretically, it would at least indicate a few open channels for each medium in each SMSA. Once the technical or economic limits of existing services have been reached (as has already happened in

TABLE VII

Media Outlets and Voices Per 1000 People

Market Group	1922	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
A. Media Outlets Per 1000						
Top 10	.018	.014	.011	.016	.018	.019
Top 25	.024	.016	.013	.018	.022	.027
Top 50	.026	.018	.016	.024	.028	.032
Top 100	.028	.021	.020	.031	.036	.046
B. Media Voices Per 1000						
Top 10	.017	.012	.010	.011	.013	.013
Top 25	.022	.014	.011	.012	.015	.016
Top 50	.026	.013	.014	.016	.020	.021
Top 100	.027	.017	.017	.020	.025	.029